Case 1:19-cv-03619-VSB-RWL Document 31 Filed 09/23/19 Page 1 of 2

CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

One Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006-1470 T: +1 212 225 2000 F: +1 212 225 3999

clearygottlieb.com

WASHINGTON, D.C. · PARIS · BRUSSELS · LONDON · MOSCOW FRANKFURT · COLOGNE · ROME · MILAN · HONG KONG BEHING · BUENOS AIRES · SÃO PAULO · ABU DHABI · SEOUL

> D: +1 212-225-2490 jblackman@cgsh.com

THOMAS J. MOLONEY
DAVID G. SABEL
JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN
RICHARD S. LINGER
JAMES A. DUNCAN
STEVEN M. LOEB
CRAIGE SEADO
NICOLAS GRACAR
STEVEN L. SELUSI
PAUL J. SHIM
STEVEN L. LEWIS
PAUL J. SHIM
STEVEN L. WILINER
ERIKA W. NIJENHUIS
ANDRES DE LA CRUZ
DAVID C. LOPEZ
MICHAEL M. GRASTENZANG
LEWIS J. LIMAN
LEVL. DASSIN
NEIL Q. WHORISKEY
JORGE U. JUANTORNA
MICHAEL D. WEINBERGER
DAVID LEINWAND
DIANA L. WOLLMAN
JEFFREY A. ROSENTHAL
ETHAN A. KLINGSBERG
MICHAEL D. DAYAN
CARMINED B. BOCOLZI, JR.
JEFFREY A. RAYMOND
SUBJGK. KANG
SUBJGK. KANG
SUBJGK. CANGOBY
SANDRAL FLOW
SANDRAL FLOW
SANDRAL FLOW
FRANCISCO L. CESTERO

FRANCESCA L. ODELL
WILLIAM L. MCRAE
JASON FACTOR
JOON H. KIM
MARGARET S. PEPONIS
LISA M. SCHWEITZER
JUAN G. GIRALDEZ
DUAN E. MEALDEZ
DUAN E. GIRALDEZ
DAN E. GIRALDEZ
DIAN E. GI

MAURICE R. GINDO
KATHERINE R. REAVES
RAHUL MÜKHI
RESIDENT PARTNERS
SANDRA M. ROCKS
S. DOUGLAS BORISKY
JUDITH KASSEL
BOAVID E. WEEB
PENELOPE L. CHRISTOPHOROU
BOAZ S. MORAG
MARY E. ALCOCK
HEIDE H. LIGENFRITZ
KATHLEEN M. EMBERGER
AVRAME L. LUFF
ANDREW WEAVER
AVRAME L. HUFF
ANDREW WEAVEN
RELENAK, GRANNIS
JOHN V. HARRISON
CAROLINE F. HAYDAY
NEL R. MARKEL
KENNETH S. BLAZEJEWSKI
ANDREA M. BASHAM
LAURA BAGARELLA
SHIRLEY M. LO
SUSANNA E. PARKER
KESIDENT GOUNSEL

DAVID H. HERRINGTON KIMBERLY R. SPOERRI AARON J. MEYERS DANIEL C. REYNOLDS ABENA A. MAINOO

HUGH C. CONROY, JR JOSEPH LANZKRON

LOUISE M. PARENT OF COUNSEL

September 23, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND ECF

The Honorable Vernon S. Broderick United States District Court for the Southern District of New York 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007 BroderickNYSDChambers@nysb.uscourts.gov

Re: Vale S.A. v. BSG Resources Limited, No. 19-cv-3619

Dear Judge Broderick:

We write on behalf of Vale S.A. ("Vale"), the petitioner in the above-captioned summary proceeding for recognition and enforcement of Vale's arbitral award (the "Award") against BSG Resources Limited ("BSGR") [ECF No. 1], to report on a recent development in the United Kingdom that is relevant to this proceeding.

BSGR's sole ground for opposing recognition and enforcement in the United States under the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, opened for signature, June 10, 1958, 21 U.S.T. 2517, reprinted in 9 U.S.C. § 201 (historical and statutory notes) (the "New York Convention") is that the Award supposedly was "suspended" by the High Court of Justice, Business and Property Courts of England and Wales, Commercial Court (QBD) (the "English High Court"), pending the resolution of BSGR's application to set it aside in the United Kingdom, where the Award was rendered. See BSGR's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Petition for Recognition and Enforcement of a Foreign Arbitration Award and in Support of Cross-Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, to Adjourn the Decision on the Enforcement of the Award (the "Opposition to Petition for Recognition and Enforcement"), ECF No. 20 at 5-6.

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, p. 2

On September 20, 2019, the English High Court denied BSGR's application to set aside the Award and refused a stay of execution. See Exhibit A, Order of the Honorable Mrs Justice Moulder dated 20 September 2019. The only ground raised by BSGR for opposing enforcement of the Award under Article V of the New York Convention, even if it had any merit, which it did not, see Vale's Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Petition for Recognition and Enforcement, ECF No. 22 at 2-3, is therefore now moot, and Vale respectfully requests that its petition be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jonathan I. Blackman

cc: Frederick Hyman, Esq. Michael R. Lastowski, Esq.

¹ BSGR's challenge to the Award remains pending in the English High Court, but even BSGR does not contend that this "suspends" the Award. Rather, BSGR relies on its challenge as a ground to stay the decision on Vale's Petition. *See* BSGR's Opposition to Petition for Recognition and Enforcement, ECF No. 20 at 6-7. For the reasons set forth in Vale's Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Respondent's Opposition to Petition for Recognition and Enforcement, ECF No. 24, that request is meritless.